



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,583	03/25/2004	Jason M. Bell	AUS920040052US1	7109
45993 7590 10/28/2008 IBM CORPORATION (RHF) C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ P. O. BOX 23324 OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123				
EXAMINER				
LOVEL, KIMBERLY M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2167				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/28/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/809,583

Applicant(s)

BELL ET AL.

Examiner

KIMBERLY LOVEL

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is in response to the Amendment filed 29 July 2008.
2. Claims 8-13 are currently pending. In the Amendment filed 29 July 2008, claims 8 and 13 are amended and claims 1-7 and 14-19 are cancelled. This action is made Final.
3. The previous prior art rejections have been withdrawn as necessitated by applicant's amendment.

Specification

4. The objection to the specification is withdrawn as necessitated by applicant's amendment.

Claim Objections

5. The objection to claim 19 objected is withdrawn as necessitated by applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The rejections of claims 1, 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement are withdrawn as necessitated by applicant's arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. The rejections of Claims 1-7 and 14-19 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter are withdrawn as necessitated by applicant's arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. **Claims 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2002/0147857 to Sanchez, II et al (hereafter Sanchez) in view of US PGPub 2008/0086402 to Patel et al (hereafter Patel) in view of US Patent No 6,539,425 to Stevens et al (hereafter Stevens).**

Referring to claim 8, Sanchez discloses a method for handling real-time attributes in a static directory comprising:

providing at least one declaration for a directory attribute (see [0050]);

parsing requests for access to directory attribute values to detect requests for attributes declared in said attribute declarations (see [0056])

invoking at least one Real-Time Attribute Processor (RTAP) selector from a plurality of attribute processor according to a predetermined selection schema and to invoke said selected RTAP (see [0030], lines 7-15); and

returning to a requester said attribute value [populating the object] (see [0062]).

However, Sanchez fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations wherein the attributes are to be handled as a real-time attribute whose value is retrievable outside of static memory of a directory structure and obtaining an attribute value from a real-time source external to said directory structure. Patel discloses the wherein the attributes are to be handled as a real-time attribute, the value of said declared real-time attribute is retrievable external of said directory structure [attributes fetched in real-time] and being in a format incompatible with a directory access return format and obtaining an attribute value from a real-time source external to said directory structure (see [0074] and [1056]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize concept of fetching dynamic attributes in real-time as disclosed by Patel with the logical device of Sanchez. One would have been motivated to so in order to introduce the concept of providing customer personalization in real-time to Sanchez

which increases accuracy of the dynamic data and decreases the resources required to poll and push dynamic data to the LDAP (Patel: see [0005]).

The combination of Patel and Sanchez (hereafter Patel/Sanchez) fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of the format not being backwards compatible, converting an attribute and suppressing or avoiding storing of the converted attribute value. Stevens et al discloses an LDAP directory including the further limitations of not being backwards compatible, converting an attribute (see claim 38) and suppressing or avoiding storing of the converted attribute value (see column 12, lines 44-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the concept of not storing values and converting values as disclosed by Stevens with the LDAP directory of Patel/Sanchez. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase system efficiency by reducing the amount of required storage space.

Referring to claim 9, the combination of Sanchez/Patel and Stevens (hereafter Sanchez/Patel/Stevens) discloses the method as set forth in claim 8 wherein said step of selecting and invoking a RTAP selector comprises selecting an RTAP based upon a variation of a name of said resolved directory attribute (Sanchez: see [0019] and [0031]).

Referring to claim 10, Sanchez/Patel/Stevens discloses the method as set forth in claim 9 wherein said step of selecting an RTAP based upon an attribute name variation comprises a name identifying a function selected from the group of a logical device, a device address, a name of a JAVA class [Java objects], a name of a UNIX

shared object, and a name of a dynamically linked library module (Sanchez: see [0008]).

Referring to claim 11, Sanchez/Patel/Stevens discloses the method as set forth in claim 8 wherein said step of invoking RTAP from the group of a logical device, a device address, a name of a JAVA class [Java objects], a name of a UNIX shared object, and a name of a dynamically linked library module (Sanchez: see [0008]).

Referring to claim 12, Sanchez/Patel/Stevens discloses the method as set forth in claim 8 wherein said step of parsing a request comprises parsing a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol [LDAP] requests for attribute values (Sanchez: see [0008]).

Referring to claim 13, Sanchez/Patel/Stevens discloses the method as set forth in claim 8 wherein said step of returning to a requestor an attribute value comprises returning said value according to a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (Sanchez: see [0008]).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US PGPub 2004/0064502 to Yellepeddy et al

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY LOVEL whose telephone number is (571)272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167

Kimberly Lovel
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

27 October 2008
kml

